No. 13. VOL. IV.

The Balance, AND COLUMBIAN REPOSITORY.

" HAIL SACRED POLITY, BY FREEDOM REAR'D !
" HAIL SACRED FREEDOM, WHEN BY LAW RESTRAIN'D !"
BEATTIE.

HUDSON, (NEW-YORK) TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 1805.

Editorial.

[SUBJECT CONTINUED.]

THE acquittal of Judge CHASE is rendered doubly honorable to him, by the ſingular manner in which the accuſations were brought againſt him. There had been no formal complaint of his conduct, on which his enemies could ground an accuſation. He was not impeached for any one act. Had that been the caſe, his acquittal would have proved him innocent of that *one act only*. But, as the buſineſs has been conducted, the reſult has proved the purity of his conduct, thro' the whole courſe of his official life.

Let us recollect how the proceedings againſt Judge Chaſe commenced: Early in the ſeſſion of 1803—4, a member of the houſe of repreſentatives of the U. States, obſerved, that he had ſeen in ſome of the newſpapers, certain remarks and ſuggeſtions, which induced him to believe that Samuel Chaſe had, in certain caſes, while acting as Judge, manifeſted a tyrannical and arbitrary diſpoſition, &c. &c. &c.—He therefore moved, that a committee be appointed to enquire into, and examine *all* the official conduct of the ſaid Chaſe, to ſee if ſomething could not be found, on which an impeachment could be grounded. Groſsly abſurd as this motion was, a majority of the houſe ſanctioned it; and a committee was appointed, principally, if not wholly, compoſed of men moſt decidedly and openly hoſtile to the Judge. This committee of inquiſition was inveſted with power to ſend for perſons and papers, to examine, enquire, &c. Their zeal was meaſured by their malevolence. They purſued their taſk with "guilty diligence;" and, after months ſpent in the reſearch, they reported, juſt at the cloſe of the ſeſſion, a whole volume of *exparte* teſtimony, on which they founded ſix articles of impeachment. Contrary to every principle of right and juſtice, this teſtimony was publiſhed and circulated throughout the union. In vain did the friends of Judge Chaſe contend againſt this ſcandalous proceeding. In vain did they demand an immediate hearing, that the poiſon might be accompanied by its antidote. Congreſs roſe; and the injured and perſecuted Judge, was compelled to ſit quietly down, and ſee his enemies turning the current of public opinion againſt him, without having it in his power to raiſe up a mound of defence. Every little dabbler in filth....every two-penny preſſman, devoted to Jefferſon, and "inſtigated by the devil," broke up his ſluices, and poured his puddle of mud into the great ſtream. From the Salt Mountains of Louiſiana to Canada, the vileſt calumnies were diſſeminated. Charges the moſt baſe....accuſations the moſt unfounded, were publiſhed and republiſhed again and again; and many a typographical tribunal had paſſed its ſentence of condemnation, long before the Judge had been heard in his defence. So falſe and deceptive was the colouring given to the whole buſineſs, by Judge Chaſe's enemies, that thouſands of his friends began to ſicken at the proſpect, and actually conſidered his fate as irretrievably fixed.

Under all theſe unfavorable circumſtances, the Judge appeared before his accuſers, at the laſt ſeſſion, to defend himſelf againſt the ſix charges; when to his aſtoniſhment he found, that the inquiſitorial committee, without authority or any previous intimation of their deſign, had annexed two new articles to the old batch of accuſations. By this deſpicable trick, his enemies hoped to take him unawares, and thus deprive him of an opportunity to make the neceſſary preparation for his defence. From this moment, ſome of the honeſt and independent democratic members of the houſe of repreſentatives began to view the conduct of Randolph and his junto, with diſguſt and indignation; and in conſequence, the Judge was allowed a month to make out his defence.

From this ſtatement, it is evident, that if Judge Chaſe, during his official life, had ever been guilty of any miſconduct, he could not have eſcaped conviction. His accuſers and his judges were politically, and many of them perſonally, his enemies. They were urged by every thing but honeſty, to convict him. Party feelings and prejudices were enliſted againſt him. The paſſions of the people had been wrought upon. The preſs had been employed in the ſervice of perſecution. In ſhort, the Judge went to trial under almoſt every diſadvantage. He had, it is true, that "ſtrong breaſt-plate, a heart untainted;" and on that alone he relied. *That*, thank Heaven, proved ſufficient. His enemies, by their verdict, have teſtified his innocence. They have taken infinite pains, and expended vaſt ſums of the people's money, to convince the world, that a man who, more than any other, has been calumniated, was the leaſt deſerving of cenſure. They have officially given the lie to charges which they have non-officially repeated a thouſand times.—They have unwittingly done the public an eſſential ſervice, and we have only to de-

fire that they will proceed, until they have wiped away all the foul ſtains which they have been, for years, attempting to caſt upon every diſtinguiſhed federaliſt in the United States.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

Political.

FROM THE WASHINGTON FEDERALIST.

IT was not in our power to accompany the reſolutions of Meſſrs. Randolph and Nicholſon, given in our laſt, with the debates which aroſe on the occaſion. We are now enabled to furniſh our readers with a ſketch of that debate, and regret, that it cannot be given more at large.—Enough, however, is given, to make every American bluſh for his country, when ſo dignified and important an aſſembly as the H. of Repreſentatives, is made the vehicle for envenomed ſpleen and mortified pride to vent themſelves, when it is doomed ſilently and patiently to bear the teſty humors of every domineering upſtart, and to hear the moſt violent and indecent invectives againſt a co-ordinate legiſlative branch of the government, for daring to expreſs an independent opinion.—Nay more.—Theſe things ſhould not only make us bluſh for the degradation of our country—but tremble for its liberties, when we ſee a few aſpiring demagogues thus ſetting at defiance all laws of decency and decorum, and endeavoring to graſp all the powers of the government. What! Becauſe the members of the Senate, would not betray their truſt, violate their oaths, and give up their independence to the pride, the ambition, or the *intereſt* of ſuch men as Randolph and Nicholſon, they are to be denounced and cenſured, and their conduct and motives queſtioned in the Houſe of Repreſentatives. Had any member of the Senate thus have dared, to queſtion the conduct of the Houſe of Repreſentatives, it would have been conſidered as a breach of privilege, and that body would have been called on to puniſh the offending member.

We have but a melancholy proſpect before us, if ſome important proviſion of the Conſtitution is to allay the angry paſſions, or heal the wounded pride of every haughty and inſolent demagogue. How does this caſe ſtand? The Senate of the U. States, has dared to oppoſe the wiſhes of Meſſrs. Randolph and Nicholſon, and therefore the Houſe of Repreſentatives is called on to paſs a vote of cenſure, and the people to alter the Conſtitution. Mighty indeed, muſt be the reſentment, which graſps at ſo great a ſacrifice to be appeaſed.

Subject the Senate and the Judiciary to the Houſe of Repreſentatives, and in vain may unprotected innocence look for refuge from the oppreſſion of power and influence. We ſhall ſoon become the ready inſtruments and willing ſlaves of a ſingle deſpot. Several members voted againſt the reſolutions, becauſe they thought them impolitic and ill-timed, but approved of the principle.—Let the people be on their guard, leſt theſe reſolutions, ſtart up in a more diſguiſed dreſs, and in a more auſpicious moment. If ſuch alterations ſhould ever be made, we may bid adieu to our Conſtitution, and with it too our Union, Liberty and Independence. There are many enemies to the Conſtitution, who have not the boldneſs openly to expreſs ſuch enmity. In a large party in Waſhington, the Britiſh Conſtitution became the ſubject of converſation. Mr. Randolph there declared, that in a Republican Government there ought to be NO WRITTEN CONSTITUTION. His late conduct, is a commentary on this text. All this party were a number of Mr. Randolph's political friends. And yet with this knowledge of his hoſtility to the Conſtitution, they look up to him as one of their principal leaders and ſupporters, and yet profeſs to be the firmeſt friends and warmeſt advocates of that very Conſtitution, he is laboring thus ſecretly and openly to deſtroy. Hear, O Iſrael, and judge.

In Mr. Jefferſon's letter to Mazzei, he ſays "That their," meaning Waſhington, and the federaliſts, "avowed object, is, "to impoſe on us the ſubſtance, as they "have already given us the form of the "Britiſh Government."

Randolph is now ſeeking to impoſe on us, that "ſubſtance." He wiſhes to make congreſs, like the Parliament of England, the paramount authority, and to make the Judges in this country as in England, dependent on the Legiſlature, by ſubjecting them to a removal, on the addreſs of both houſes.

It is an old and very ſucceſsful trick among theſe pretended lovers of the people, to accuſe others of intending the very miſchief, they are preparing to commit. It is ſomething like the perſon, who attempts to ſcreen himſelf from a fault, by accuſing the injured, and thus putting him on the defenſive. This raiſes a ſmoke, and then like Æneas in the cloud, walk on undiſcovered in the work of deſtruction.

It is already known, that Judge Chaſe had been acquitted by the Senate of all the charges brought againſt him in the morning of the firſt of March. On the evening of the ſame day, the Houſe of Repreſentatives met according to adjournment and were proceeding, in great good humour, to diſpatch the load of buſineſs, which, in conſequence of the impeachment, remained unfiniſhed—when Mr. Randolph (who we believe had juſt taken his ſeat about half paſt ſeven) roſe, apparently in a high ſtate of irritation, and addreſſed the chair. It was at firſt ſuggeſted to him that there were ſeveral bills from the Senate to be read; but he anſwered in his uſual imperative tone, that they were of no importance compared to the buſineſs to which he wiſhed to draw the attention of the Houſe, and demanded of the Speaker, whether he had not a right to addreſs the Chair. No anſwer being given—he proceeded, in a ſtile of bitter invective, againſt the deciſion of the Senate—but it is out of our power to pretend to give any ſketch of his Speech. He more than once called the Judge an *acquitted Felon*—talked of what had taken place, as the mere mockery of a trial, and ridiculed all idea of any offender ever being puniſhed by impeachment. He obſerved, that it was high time that the people ſhould begin to look to themſelves, and forgetting all minor points, to rally round their real friends. After running on this way for ſome time, and calling thoſe who had voted with him for the Impeachment, to ſupport the reſolution he was about to offer, he preſented it in the form and words following, and moved to have it conſidered.

"*Reſolved*, by the Senate and Houſe of Repreſentatives of the United States of America, in congreſs aſſembled, two-thirds of both houſes concuring, That the following article be ſubmitted to the legiſlatures of the ſeveral ſtates, which when ratified and confirmed by the legiſlatures of three fourths of the ſaid ſtates, ſhall be valid and binding as a part of the conſtitution of the United States.

"The judges of the Supreme and all other Courts of the United States ſhall be removed by the Preſident on the joint addreſs of both Houſes of Congreſs requeſting the ſame, any thing in the Conſtitution of the United States to the contrary notwithſtanding."

This reſolution having been ſeconded, Mr. Nicholſon got up, to appearance, in a higher ſtate of irritation and anger, than his precurſer—and having expreſſed his perfect acquieſcence in every word which fell from his friend—ſaid, That he not only agreed with him, as far as he went, but thought that his reſolution did not go far enough. He therefore begged leave to preſent another, which he thought was abſolutely neceſſary, in order to prevent gentlemen in high ſtations, from forgetting altogether, to whom they owed their authority with which they were inveſted. For his part, he could not ſee why the immediate Repreſentatives of the people ſhould hold their ſeats only for *two* years, and that Senators, who were only the Repreſentatives of the Repreſentatives of the

people, ſhould continue to enjoy their's during *ſix*.

Here follows Mr. Nicholſon's reſolution.

"Reſolved, That the following article, when adopted by two-thirds of both Houſes of Congreſs and by the Legiſlatures of three-fourths of the reſpective States, ſhall become a part of the Conſtitution of the United States, viz.

"That the Legiſlature of any State may, whenever the ſaid Legiſlature may think proper, recal at any period whatever, any Senator of the United States, who may have been elected by them, and whenever a vote of the Legiſlature, of any State vacating the ſeat of any Senator of the United States who may have been elected by the ſaid State, ſhall be made known to the Senate of the United States, the ſeat of ſuch Senator ſhall thenceforth be vacated."

In anſwer to an obſervation, which, in the courſe of the debate, fell from Mr. Findley, or ſome other gentleman, viz. that his reſolution went to reduce the Senate to a mere *Corps Diplomatique*, he ſaid, that this was his intention—that the Senators repreſented the ſovereignties of the ſeveral States and ought to be entirely dependent on them.

Mr. Elliot, among other remarks, obſerved, that to complete the climax, he would recommend to the gentleman to bring forward another reſolution to the following effect, (We do not pretend to give the words of any gentleman, but merely the ſubſtance of his ideas,) viz:

"That whereas the people of the United States have no longer any occaſion for the Conſtitution, therefore reſolved, that the preſent Conſtitution be aboliſhed and declared null and void, and that the good people of theſe States, will in future, embark and take their chance on the tempeſtuous ſea of anarchy."

Mr. Huger oppoſed both reſolutions, and regretted that the gentlemen ſuffered their paſſions to get ſo much the better of them, as to induce them to bring forward theſe reſolutions—which, even were they correct themſelves, when brought forward ſo immediately after the late trial and acquittal of the Judge, muſt be regarded, as only intended to convey a cenſure on the part of the Houſe of Repreſentatives, on the conduct of the Senate.

Mr. Varnum, Mr. Smilie, and ſeveral other gentlemen, though not inimical to the principle contained in Mr. Randolph's reſolution, diſapproved unequivocally of the amendment of Mr. Nicholſon, and regretted that either had been brought forward at that ſtage of the ſeſſion, and particularly ſo immediately after the deciſion of the Senate.

Mr. Roger Nelſon approved of both reſolutions--at leaſt ſuch is believed by ſome of the gentlemen with whom we have converſed.

Mr. Griſwold, after the poſtponement of the reſolutions ſupported a motion made to print them—which was carried.

The above are ſome of the details of this curious tranſaction—which we have been able to collect. They are ſubſtantially correct, and we regret much that we cannot preſent a more circumſtantial deſcription of the tranſactions of an evening—highly intereſting—but we are ſorry to add, little honorable to the principal actors in the ſcene—or to the highly reſpectable body to which they belong.

FROM THE CHARLESTON COURIER.

A few days ſince it was mentioned in the public papers, that the Legiſlature of Ohio had granted leave for a bill to be introduced for changing the names of the counties of *Adams*, *Hamilton*, and *Roſs!*

Thoſe legiſlators who ſit down to change ſuch names of counties to ſome others, probably to *Beelzebub*, *Buonaparte*, and *Robeſpierre*, have found out an office better fitted for their hearts and heads than making good laws. Thoſe citizens of the ſwamps and ſtateſmen of the ſcalping-knife, had better croſs the mountains, and go to ſome ſchool for grown perſons; there they will ſtand a chance of learning that there are ſuch things in the world as hiſtories, and national records—and that, unleſs they can contrive to burn all the libraries in America and Europe, their important malice can no more expunge the glories of HAMILTON and ADAMS from the annals of the world, than a drop of the Crocodile tears, once ſhed by their lord and maſter over the grave of WASHINGTON, could melt away a mountain of adamant. Poor wretches:—they have juſt intellect enough to betray their malice, but not wit enough to give it effect. COLUMBUS lives to everlaſting fame by his deeds, while that of Americus Veſpuſius is only kept alive, like a ſpark under the aſhes, by the miſnomer of America, which, in juſtice, ought to be called Columbia. The fame of the former was built on other grounds than the naming of a place. Thoſe legiſlators may not, however, be without an object; they may have got a hint to begin a ſeries of changes, meditated by our ruling faction, in humble imitation of the French Jacobin Uſurpers, by whom "*Nothing, no, nothing was left unchanged.*" The offices being exhauſted, for means to ſhew their malice, they now purvey for their turpitude in the names of places. The Savages of the Ohio have rouſed the game, and the war-whoop will ſoon reach the Atlantic, where Americans may be aſſured not a town will be left bearing the name of WASHINGTON! Mr. EPPES, the Preſident's ſon-in-law, wants to have the territory of Columbia re-ceded to Maryland and Virginia—this is a circumſtance coincident.

In one requeſt they are right—they take from the rich what the rich do not want, & give it to *the poor indeed*. A JEFFERSON'S fame, like that of AMERICUS, may be bolſtered up for a while by the name of a place, but the fame of a WASHINGTON, a HAMILTON, or an ADAMS, like that of COLUMBUS, will live till, to uſe the beautiful idea of BEN JOHNSON, Time ſhall throw a dart at Death.

——Sidney's Sister—Pembroke's mother,
Death, e'er thou haſt ſtruck another
Fair and learned and good as ſhe,
Time ſhall throw a dart at thee.

Editor's Closet.

"PAM BE CIVIL."

FOOT, district-attorney, has resigned his office! thus evincing a nicer sense of shame, than the council of appointment, who have thus long kept him in office, to the disgrace of the district.—The Lansingburgh Gazette, however, says, that "Foot was permitted to choose between *resignation* and *removal*;" and remarks, that "many a man has committed *suicide*, to avoid a *public execution*."

A paltry democratic print, celebrated (if it has any celebrity) for its total disregard of truth and decency, thus disingenuously treats the acquittal of Judge Chase—

"Judge Chase is acquitted, having been declared *not guilty* on five articles of his impeachment, and *guilty* on three, but by too small majorities to enable the court to *inflict any punishment* on him," &c.

No argument is necessary to shew the baseness of this paragraph. The declaration or sentence of the court is amply sufficient. As officially published, it is in these words.—

"The President then said—from this statement, then it appears that there is not a constitutional majority on *any one article*; and it therefore now becomes my duty to declare, Samuel Chase, Esq. stands acquitted of *all the articles* of impeachment laid against him."

THE CLOVEN FOOT.

The devil, it is said, can put on any disguise, or assume any form that he pleases: but, that he may not carry his deceptions too far, he is doomed, in all his transactions, to retain one mark by which he can be distinguished....*his cloven foot*. Thus 'tis with the democrats, [we mean the *anarchists*, not the honest democrats.] They can assume any shape; but they cannot hide their *cloven foot*. The *Barometer*, after expressing the utmost chagrin at the acquittal of Judge Chase, exclaims—

"It is time to look for other remedies beside IMPEACHMENT."

Yes, yes—if these federal judges are to be allowed fair trials, it is all in vain to think of getting rid of them. Why, they will all prove themselves innocent. Some other remedy must therefore be sought for. "They order these things better in France." There neither trial nor impeachment is necessary. The guillotine is their remedy for "oppressed humanity."

Judge Chase.

In the Senate of the United States,

SITTING AS A

High Court of Impeachment,

ON THE

Fourth day of February, A. D. 1805.

UNITED STATES vs. SAMUEL CHASE.

The answer, and pleas of SAMUEL CHASE, *one of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, to the articles of impeachment, exhibited against him in the said Court, by the honorable, the House of Representatives of the United States, in support of their impeachment, against him, for high crimes and misdemeanors, supposed to have been by him committed.*

[CONTINUED.]

IN concluding his defence against those charges contained in the fourth article of impeachment, he declares, that his whole conduct in that trial, was regulated by a strict regard to the principles of law, and by an honest desire to do justice between the United States and the party accused. He felt a sincere wish, on the one hand, that the traverser might establish his innocence, by those fair and sufficient means which the law allows; and a determination on the other; that he should not, by subterfuges, and frivolous pretences, sport with the justice of the country, and evade that punishment of which, if guilty he was so proper an object. These intentions he is confident, were legal and laudable; and, if in any part of his conduct, he swerved from this line, it was an error of his judgment and not of his heart.

And the said respondent for plea to the said fourth article of impeachment, saith, that he is not guilty of any high crime and misdemeanor, as in and by the said fourth article is alledged against him, and this he prays, may be enquired of by this honorable court, in such manner as law and justice shall seem to them to require.

The fifth article of impeachment charges this respondent, with having awarded "a capias against the body of the said James Thompson Callender, indicted for an offence *not capital*, whereupon the said Callender was arrested and committed to *close* custody, contrary to law in that case made and provided"

The charge is rested, 1st, on the act of Congress of September 24th, 1789, entitled, "an act to establish the Judicial Courts of the United States," by which it is enacted, "that for any crime or offence against the United States, the offender may be arrested, imprisoned, or bailed, agreeably to the usual mode of process, in the state where such offender may be found." And 2dly, on a law of the State of Virginia, which is said to provide, "that upon *presentment* by any grand jury, of an offence *not capital*, the court shall order the clerk to issue a *summons* against the person or persons so offending, to appear and answer such presentment at the *next* court."—It is contended, in support of this charge, that the act of Congress above-mentioned, made the State law the rule of proceeding, and that the State law was violated by issuing a capias against Callender, instead of a summons.

The first observation to be made on this part of the case is, that the date of the law of Virginia is not mentioned in the article. A very material omission! For it cannot be intended, that by the act of Congress in question, which was passed for establishing the laws of the U. States, and regulating their proceedings, it was intended to render those proceedings dependent on all *future* acts of the State legislatures.—The intention certainly was, to adopt, to a certain limited extent, the regulations existing in the States at the time of passing the act. Consequently, a law of Virginia, passed after this act, can have no operation on the proceedings under it. But by referring to the law of Virginia in question, it will be found to bear date on November 13th, 1792, more than three years after the act of Congress, by which it is said to have been adopted. But the omission of the date of this law of Virginia, is not the most material oversight which has been made in citing it. Its title is "An act directing the method of proceeding against free persons, charged with certain crimes," &c. and it enacts, section 28th, "That upon presentment made by the grand jury, of an offence not capital, the court shall order the clerk to issue a summons, or *other proper process*, against the person or persons so presented, to appear and answer at the next court." It will be observed that these words, "or other proper process," which leave it perfectly in the discretion of the court what process shall issue, provided it be such as is proper for bringing the offender to answer to the presentment, are omitted in this article of impeachment.

From these words it is perfectly manifest, that the law of Virginia, admitting it to apply, did not order a summons to be issued, but left it perfectly in the discretion of the court to issue a summons, or such other process as they should judge proper. It is therefore, a sufficient answer to this article to say, that this respondent considered a capias as the proper process, and therefore ordered it to issue; which he admits that he did, immediately after the presentment was found against the said Callender, by the grand jury.

This he is informed and expects to prove, has been the construction of this law by the courts of Virginia, and their general practice. Indeed it would be most strange, if any other construction or practice had been adopted. There are many offences not capital, which are of a very dangerous tendency, and on which very severe punishment is inflicted by the laws of Virginia; and to enact by law, that in all such cases, however notorious or profligate the offender might be, the courts should be obliged, after a presentment by the grand jury, to proceed against them by summons; would be to enact, that as soon as their guilt was rendered extremely probable, by the presentment of a grand jury, they should receive regular notice, to escape from punishment by flight or concealment.

It will also appear, as this respondent believes, by a reference to the laws and practice of Virginia, into which he has made all the enquiries which circumstances and the shortness of time allowed him for preparing his answer, would permit, that all the cases in which a summons it considered as the only proper process, are cases of petty offences, which on the presentment of a grand jury, are to be tried by the court in a summary way, without the intervention of a petit jury. Therefore, these provisions had no application to the case of Callender, which could be no otherwise proceeded on than by indictment, and trial on the indictment by a petit jury.

It must be recollected that the act of Congress of September 24th, 1789, enacts, section 14, "That the courts of the United States, shall have power to issue writs of scire facias, habeas corpus, *and all other writs*, not specially provided for by statute, which may be necessary for the exercise of their respective jurisdictions, and agreeably to the principles and usages of laws." Consequently, the circuit court, where the proceedings in question, took place, had power to issue a capias against the the traverser, on the presentment unless the State law above-mentioned governed the case, and contained something to restrain the issuing of that writ in such a case This respondent contends for the reasons above stated, that this law neither applied to the case, or contained any thing to prevent the issuing of a capias, if it had been applied.

Thus it appears that this respondent, in ordering a capias to issue against Callender, decided correctly, as it certainly was his intention to do. But he claims no other merit than that of upright intention in this decision: for when he made the decision, he was utterly ignorant that such a law existed in Virginia; and declares that he never heard of it, till this article was reported by a committee of the House of Representatives, during the present session of Congress. This law was not mentioned on the trial either by the counsel for the traverser or by judge Griffin, who certainly had much better opportunities of knowing it than this respondent, and who, no doubt, would have cited it had they known it, and considered it as applicable to the case. This respondent well knows that in a criminal view, ignorance of the law excuses no man in offending against it; but this maxim applies not to the decision of a judge; in whom ignorance of the law in general would certainly be a disqualification for this office, though not a crime; but ignorance of a particular act of Assembly of a State, where he was an utter stranger, must be considered as a very pardonable error; especially as the counsel for the prisoner to whose case that law is supposed to have applied, forbore or omitted to cite it; and as a judge of the State, always resident in it, and long conversant with its local laws, either forgot this law, or considered it as inapplicable.

Such is the answer, which this respondent makes to the fifth article of impeachment. If he erred in this case, it was through ignorance of the law, and surely, ignorance under such circumstances, cannot be a crime, much less a high crime and misdemeanor, for which he ought to be removed from his office. If a judge were impeachable for acting against law from ignorance only, it would follow, that he would be punished in the same manner for deciding against law wilfully, and for deciding against it through mistake. In other words, there would be no distinction between ignorance and design, between error and corruption.

And the said respondent, for plea to the said fifth article of impeachment, saith, that he is not guilty of any high crime and misdemeanor, as in and by the said fifth article is alledged against him; and this he prays, may be enquired of, by this honorable court, in such manner, as law and justice shall seem to them to require.

The sixth article of impeachment alledges, that this respondent, "with intent to oppress and procure the conviction of the said James Thompson Callender, did, at the court aforesaid, rule and adjudge the said Callender to trial, during the term at which he, the said Callender was presented and indicted, contrary to the law in that case made and provided.

This charge also, is founded, 1st, on the act of Congress of Sept. 24th, 1789, above mentioned, which enacts, section 34, "that the laws of the several states, except where the constitution, treaties, or statutes of the United States shall otherwise provide, shall be regarded as the rules of decision, in trials at *common law* in the courts of the United States, in cases where they apply," and 2ndly, on a law of the state of Virginia, which is supposed to provide, "that in cases not capital, the offender shall not be held to answer any presentment of a grand jury, until the court next succeeding that, during which such presentment shall have been made." This law, it is contended, is made the rule of decision by the above mentioned act of Congress, and was violated by the refusal to continue the case of Callender till the next term

In answer to this charge this respondent declares, that he was at the time of making the above mentioned decision, wholly ignorant of any such law of Virginia as that in question, that no such law was adduced or mentioned by the counsel of Callender, in support of their motion for a continuance; neither when they first made it, before this respondent sitting alone; nor when they renewed it, after Judge Griffin had taken his seat in court: that no such law was mentioned by Judge Griffin; who concurred in over-ruling the motion for a continuance and ordering on the trial; which he could not have done had he known that such a law existed, or considered it as applicable to the case; and that this respondent never heard of any such law, until the articles of impeachment now under consideraton were reported, in the course of the present session of Congress, by a committee of the House of Representatives.

A judge is certainly bound to use all proper and reasonable means of obtaining a knowledge of the laws which he is appointed to administer; but after the use of such means, to overlook, misunderstand,

or remain ignorant of some particular law, is at all times a very pardonable error. It is much more so in the case of a judge of the Supreme court of the United States, holding a circuit court in a particular state, with which he is a stranger, and with the local laws of which he can have enjoyed but very imperfect opportunities of becoming acquainted It was foreseen by Congress, in establishing the circuit courts of the United States, that difficulties and inconveniencies must frequently arise from this source, and to obviate such difficulties it was provided, that the district judge of each state, who having been a resident of the state and a practitioner in its courts, had all the necessary means of becoming acquainted with its local laws, should form a part of the circuit court in his own state. The judge of the supreme court is expected, with reason, to be well versed in the general laws; but the local laws of the state form the peculiar province of the district judge, who may be justly considered as particularly responsible for their due observance. If in the case in question, this respondent overlooked or misconstrued any local law of the state of Virginia, which ought to have governed the case, it was equally overlooked and misunderstood, not only by the prisoner's counsel who made the motion, and whose peculiar duty it was to know the law and bring it into the view of the court, but also by the district judge, who had the best opportunities of knowing and understanding it, and in whom, nevertheless, this oversight or mistake is considered as a venal error, while in this respondent it is made the ground of a criminal charge.

This respondent further states, that after the most diligent and the most extensive enquiry which the time allowed for preparing this answer would permit, he can find no law of Virginia which expressly enacts, that "in cases not capital, the offender shall not be held to answer any presentment of a grand jury, until the court next succeeding that during which such presentment shall have been made." This principle he supposes to be an inference drawn by the authors of the articles of impeachment, from the law of Virginia mentioned in the answer to the preceding article, the law of November 15th, 1792, which provides "that upon presentment made by the grand jury of an offence not capital, the court shall order the clerk to issue a summons, or other proper process, against the person or persons so presented, to appear and answer such presentment at the NEXT court." This law he conceives does not warrant the inference so drawn from it, because it speaks of *presentments* and not of *indictments*, which are very different things; and is, as he is informed, confined by practice and construction in the state of Virginia, to cases of small offences, which are to be tried by the court itself upon the presentment, without an indictment or the intervention of a petit jury. But for cases, like that of Callender, where an indictment must follow the presentment, this law made no provison. Further, the state laws are directed by the abovementioned act of Congress, to be the rule of decision in the courts of the United States, only "in cases where they apply." Whether they apply or not to a particular case, is a question of law, to be decided by the court where such case is pending, and an error in making the decision is not a crime, nor even an offence, unless it can be shewn to have proceeded from improper motives. This respondent is of opinion, that the law in question did not apply to the case of Callender, for the reasons stated above; and therefore it would have been his duty to disregard it, even had it been made known to him by the counsel for the traverser.

And in the last place he contends, that the law of Virginia in question, is not adopted by the above mentioned act of Congress as the rule of decision, in such cases as that now under consideration. That act does indeed provide "that the laws of the several states, except where the constitution, treaties or statutes of the United States shall otherwise provide, shall be regarded as rules of decision in trials at *common law* in the courts of the United States, in cases where they apply." But this provision, in his opinion, can relate only to rights acquired under the state laws, which come into question *on* the trial; & not to forms of process or modes of proceeding, anterior or preparatory to the trial. Nor can it, as this respondent apprehends, have any application to indictments for offences against the statutes of the United States, which cannot with any propriety be called "trials at common law." It relates merely, in his opinion, to civil rights acquired under the state laws; which by virtue of this provision are, when they come in question in the courts of the United States, to be governed by the laws under which they accrued.

If in these opinions this respondent be incorrect, it is an honest error: and he contends that neither such an error in the construction of a law, nor his ignorance of a local state law which he had no opportunity of knowing, and of which the counsel for the party whose case it is supposed to have affected were equally ignorant, can be considered as an offence liable to impeachment, or to any sort of punishment or blame.

And for plea to the said sixth article of impeachment, the said Samuel Chase saith, that he is not guilty of any high crime or misdemeanor as in and by the said article is alledged against him; and this he prays may be enquired of by this honcrable court in such manner as law and justice shall seem to them to require.

The seventh article of impeachment relates to some conduct of this respondent in his judicial capacity, at a circuit court of the United States held at Newcastle in the state of Delaware, in June 1800. The statement of this conduct made in the article is altogether erroneous; but if it were true, this respondent denies, that it contains any matter for which he is liable to impeachment. It alledges that "disregarding the duties of his office, he did descend from the dignity of a judge, and stoop to the level of an informer." This high offence consisted, according to the article, 1st, in refusing to discharge the grand jury although entreated by several of the said jury to do so. 2dly, in 'observing to the said grand jury, after the said grand jury had regularly declared through their foreman, that they had found no bills of indictment, and had no presentments to make, that he the said Sam. Chase understood 'that a highly seditious temper had manifested itself in the state of Delaware, among a certain class of people, particularly in Newcastle county, and more especially in the town of Wilmington, where lived a most seditious printer, unrestrained by any principle of virtue, and regardless of social order, that the name of this printer was————." 3dly, in "then checking himself as if sensible of the indecorum which he was committing." 4hly, in adding "that it might be assuming too much, to mention the name of this person; but it becomes your duty, gentlemen, to enquire diligently into this matter, or words to that effect." And 5thly, "in authoritatively enjoining on the district attorney of the United States, with intention to procure the prosecution of the printer in question, the necessity of procuring a file of the papers to which he alluded, and by a strict examination of them to find some passage, which might furnish the ground work of a prosecution against the printer."

These charges amount in substance to this; that the repondent refused to discharge a grand jury on their request, which is every day's practice, and which he was bound to do, if he believed that the due administration of justice required their longer attendance: that he directed the attention of the grand jury to an offence against a statute of the United States, which he had been informed was committed in the District; and that he desired the district attorney to aid the grand jury, in their inquiries concerning the existence and nature of this offence. By these three acts, each of which it was his duty to perform, he is alledged "to have degraded his high judicial functions, and tended to impair the public confidence in, and respect for, the tribunals of justice, so essential to the general welfare."

That this honorable court may be able to form correctly its judgment, concerning the transaction mentioned in this article, this respondent submits the following statement of it, which he avers to be true, and expects to prove.

On the 27th day of June, 1800, this respondent, as one of the associate justices of the supreme court of the United States, presided in the circuit court of the United States, then held at Newcastle in and for the district of Delaware, and was assisted by Gunning Bedford, esq. then district judge of the United States for that district. At the opening of the court on that day, this respondent according to his duty and his uniform practice delivered a charge to the grand jury in which he gave in charge to them several statutes of the United States, and among others, an act of Congress passed July 14th, 1798, entitled "An act in addition to the act for the punishment of certain crimes against the United States,' and commonly called the 'sedition law.' He directed them to enquire concerning any breaches of those statutes, and especially of that commonly called the sedition law, within the district of Delaware.

On the same day before the usual hour of adjournment, the grand jury came into court, and informed the court that they had found no indictment or presentment, and had no business before them, for which reason they wished to be discharged. This respondent replied, that it was earlier than the usual hour of discharging a grand jury; and that business might occur during the sitting of the court. He also asked them if they had no information of publications within the district, that came under the sedition law, and added, that he had been informed, that there was a paper called the 'Mirror,' published at Wilmington, which contained libellous charges against the government and president of the United States: that he had not seen that paper, but it was their duty to enquire into the subject; and if they had not turned their attention to it, the attorney for the district would be pleased to examine a file of that paper, and if he found any thing that came within the sedition law, would lay it before them." This is the substance of what the respondent said to the grand jury on that occasion, and he believes nearly his words. On the morning of the *next day*, they came into court and declared that they had no presentments or indictments to make, on which they were immediately discharged. The whole time therefore, for which they were detained, was twenty-four hours, far less than is generally required of grand juries.

In these proceedings, this respondent acted according to his sense of what the duties of his office required. It certainly was his duty to give in charge to the grand jury, all such statutes of the United States as provided for the punishment of offences, and among others, that called the sedition act; into all offences against which act, while it continued in force, the grand jury were bound by their oaths to enquire. In giving it in charge, together with the other acts of Congress for the punishment of offences, he followed moreover the example of the other judges of the supreme court, in holding their respective circuit courts. He also contends, and did then believe, that it was his duty, when informed of an offence, which the grand jury had overlooked, to direct their attention towards it, and to request for them, and even to require, if necessary, the aid of the district attorney in making their enquiries. In thus discharging what he conceives to be his duty, even if he committed an error in so considering it, he denies that he committed or could commit any offence whatever.

With respect to the remarks which he is charged by this article with having made to the grand jury, relative to "a highly seditious temper, which he had understood to have manifested itself in the state of Delaware, among a certain class of people, particularly in Newcastle county, and more especially, in the town of Wilmington," and, relative to "a most seditious printer, residing in Wilmington, unrestrained by any principle of virtue, and regardless of social order;" this respondent does not recollect or believe, that he made any such observations. But if he did make them, it could not be improper in him to tell the jury that he had received such information, if in fact he had received it; which was probably, the case, though he cannot recollect it with certainty at this distance of time. That this information, if he did receive it, was correct, so far as it regarded the printer in question, will fully ap-

pear from a file of the paper called the "Mirror of the Times," &c. published at Wilmington, Delaware, from Feb. 5th, to March 19th, 1800, inclusive, which he has obtained, and is ready to produce to this honorable court when necessary, and some extracts from which are contained in the exhibits severally marked No. 7.

And for plea to the said seventh article of impeachment, the said Samuel Chase saith, that he is not guilty of any high crime or misdemeanor, as in and by the said seventh article is alledged against him, and this he prays may be enquired of by this honorable court, in such manner as law and justice shall seem to them to require.

[TO BE CONCLUDED.]

Congress.

FROM THE COMMERCIAL ADVERTISER.

THE WINDING UP SCENE.

OF all the extraordinary occurrences which have taken place at the seat of government, during the late session of Congress, the winding up scene is perhaps the most ludicrous. A few days before the Senate had formed a decision on the trial of Judge Chase, the House of Representatives passed a bill appropriating 5,000 dollars to defray the expences of the witnesses who were summoned on the part of the managers of the impeachment. The bill was carried to the Senate, where it was read and laid on the table for farther consideration.——After the trial was closed, the bill was called up, and passed unanimously in connection with an amendment, appropriating an additional sum, sufficient to cover the expences of the witnesses for the defendant.—Thus amended it was taken down to the House, where it met with powerful and virulent opposition. When certain members had given vent to their passion, in execrating the amendments and abusing the Senate, a vote was taken on the bill as amended—it was rejected by a majority, and returned to the Senate. It was then agreed that a committee from each House should be appointed to confer on the subject. Mr. Giles & Mr. Bradley were appointed on the part of the Senate, and Messrs. Randolph, Nicholson, and Early, *(three of the managers of the impeachment)* on the part of the House of Representatives. The appointment of these men was considered, by the Senate, as extremely indecorous; still, however, the conferees met—but came to no agreement on the business. The Senate then took a final vote, and decided *unanimously*, that they would adhere to the amendment. On this occasion, Mr. Giles declared, and to his honor be it recorded, that he would never vote for an appropriation to defray the expences of witnesses, in this or in any future case, unless the witnesses of the defendant were included in the bill. The House, having been informed of the ultimate decision of the Senate, also took a final vote, persisting in the rejection of the amendment. Of course, the bill was lost.

Mr. Randolph, however, was not thus easily to be defeated in his efforts. The expences of his own witnesses must be defrayed by the U. States; but the idea that, in addition to the acquittal of the defendant, his witnesses too should be remunerated from the public treasury, was quite too much for his mortified and exasperated mind to endure. It would have furnished too great a triumph for the learned judge. He could now no longer imprecate on himself and his associates 'the disgrace of having dragged the defendant to the bar of justice' —he could no longer exclaim, "let *us* be consigned to infamy, whilst hosannas are shouted to his praise"—he could no longer declare, "thus shall it be done to *him*, whom the highest judiciary tribunal of the United States delighteth to honor." His inventive genius therefore suggested another mode of accomplishing his object.—A motion was accordingly made to defray the expences of the suit out of the sum appropriated for the contingencies of the House. This motion produced an instantaneous burst of indignation from many of his own party. Some of his best friends declared, that to commit so palpable a violation of the constitution, would be an indelible disgrace to that House, and to the character of the union. The point, however, was urged, the vote taken, and the decision declared in the affirmative. The yeas and nays were then called for, when it appeared that there was not a quorum present. Mr. Randolph then demanded the calling the roll, when it appeared that 20 or 30 more than were sufficient to form a quorum, were on the floor. The yeas and nays were again called, and again there was not a quorum. On calling the roll a second time, more than the necessary number were again present. A repetition of the same steps produced the same result. Mr. R. highly exasperated, demanded that the sergeant at arms should be dispatched to compel the attendance of absent members. Mr. R. Griswold said the demand of the gentleman might be very proper—there appeared to him, however, to be one or two trifling objections to it—if these could be surmounted, he would not oppose the motion. He observed that it had been customary for the house to be guided in its proceedings by established rules; that there was no existing rule that would warrant the measure—and that he doubted the propriety of consuming the last hour of their congressional existence in forming new rules for the government of the house. Besides, said Mr. G. some difficulties may occur in wording the commission to the sergeant at arms—it is well known that some of the members have gone home without leave, one to Delaware and another to Georgia, &c.—He hardly supposed that the gentlemen present would be willing to wait until the sergeant at arms could bring the members from those distant states. Mr Randolph waved the subject, of compelling the attendance of the absent members, and called again for the ayes and noes on the main question: Still there was not a quorum: The roll was called a fourth time—and again more than the necessary number answered to their respective names. The same farcical scene, we are informed, was exhibited no less than ten times.

At length Mr. Randolph pronounced it a piece of finesse—a mere trick, to prevent the question from being taken. A democratic member replied—"The gentleman ought to have made the discovery earlier.—It is, assuredly, a *trick*, and we who are concerned in it, are determined to *trick* him, for attempting to *trick* the Constitution." This reply so completely disarmed Mr. Randolph, that he relinquished his object; and thus no provision is made to remunerate the trouble and expense of his witnesses. *So endeth the winding up scene!!*

Be it our weekly task,
To note the passing tidings of the times.

Hudson, *March* 26.

Columbia Academy,

IN THE TOWN OF KINDERHOOK.

THE Trustees, with pleasure inform the Public, that they have employed Mr. JARED CURTIS, to take the charge of this Academy. Mr. CURTIS not only brings the most ample recommendations from the Rev. Dr. Fitch, President of Williams College, in which he lately officiated as a Tutor, but has already given such proof of his abilities as a Teacher, while in this place, that the trustees can with confidence recommend him, as well qualified to superintend the education of youth. They take the liberty to invite Parents and Guardians, to commit their children and wards to his care, feeling assured that their expectations will not be disappointed. Mr. CURTIS will commence his next quarter on the first day of April.

KINDERHOOK, *March* 13, 1805.

Gun Boat, No.——was lately launched at Washington, in presence of the pres-

dent and vice-preſident. It is ſaid that Jefferſon ſmiled, and Clinton frowned, as ſhe left the ſtocks.

The Preſident has apppointed General James Wilkinſon, Governor of Upper Louiſiana.

The Evening Poſt of Tueſday laſt, furniſhes the following article :—

Office of the United States' Gazette.

PHILADELPHIA, MARCH 18.

DEAR SIR,

I ſend you the following juſt as I have this moment received it. I am ſure it will at leaſt be *unexpected* news.

" Capt. Gildea, of the ſchr Beaver, arrived here, informs that he ſailed from Martinique on the 25th of Feb. and that two days before a French fleet of five ſail of the line, ſeven frigates, and a number of tranſports, had arrived at Fort-Royal and ſailed immediately againſt Dominico; and on the 26th of Feb. off Roſſeau, he was boarded by a French frigate, and informed that they had a paſſage of 60 days from Rochefort; that they had captured Dominico two days before, after an attack of 14 hours, with the loſs of 30 men; that the fire from the Admiral's ſhip had nearly deſtroyed the town of Roſſeau; and that they expected to be joined by a fleet of the ſame force every day. The French fleet was at anchor in Roſſeau harbour.

Two attemps have lately been make to rob the Eſſex bank in Salem, but the vaults being impregnable the thieves did not obtain any booty.

A Havannah paper of the 10th ult. received at this Office yeſterday, contains a decree of the Governor ordaining that all neutral veſſels, laden with proviſions, ſhall be permitted to enter the ports of Cuba during the blockade of the Iſland. A MS. note on the margin of the paper, dated Feb. 21 adds—" all kinds of proviſions and flour admitted into the iſland of Cuba, in veſſels of the U. States."

[*D. Adv.*]

An arrival at Salem, from Marſeilles brings an article of intelligence which, if it could be depended upon, is intereſting. The Captain informs, that " on the 2d of January he was boarded by a boat from the fleet of Lord Nelſon and informed, there was *a proſpect of peace between the United States and Tripoli very ſhortly.*" It is probable that ſome negociation may have taken place between commodore Baron and the Baſhaw ſince our laſt advices from the Mediterranean, but it is far from certain. And though ſome intercourſe had occurred, it by no means follows that a ſpeedy peace would be the reſult.

[*ibid.*]

Extract of a letter from a reſpectable gentleman of St. Jago-de-Cuba, dated February 8.

" It is ſaid that the brigand negroes are going to march againſt the city of St. Domingo, and that Deſſalines and all his principal comrades will be of the party. General Ferrand expects them; he has at leaſt 1,500 troops of the line or national guards. We have alſo received intelligence that 900 troops have arrived from France at Samana, and will reach St. Domingo before the negroes, if they intend to go there. You perhaps have heard that Gen. Deſſalines had ſent one of his naval captains, commanding an armed veſſel with 25 negroes, to ſummon Porto Plata to ſurrender. The Spaniards pretending to be overjoyed at the viſit of their French friends, invited the captain and crew to land and partake of an entertainment they had prepared. The fellows accepted the invitation, and were ſurrounded by the Spaniards, who cut all their throats, except the captain's whom they ſent to Gen. Ferrand in the ſame veſſel in which he had arrived but a few hours before. This behaviour of the Spaniards give us reaſon to hope that they will make a vigorous defence againſt the negroes; and it will be much worſe for them if they do not, for they need not expect more mercy than was ſhewn to the other whites who have fallen into their hands. This, my friend, is the only intereſting news I have to communicate reſpecting our country,"

It was lately erroneouſly ſtated that the murderer, ARNOLD, had been apprehended at Newark, (N. J.) He has, however, been taken at Pittſburgh, (Penn.) and, on examination before a magiſtrate, confeſſed himſelf guilty, and was committed to jail.

The following particulars are copied from the Pittsburgh Tree of Liberty.

Stephen Arnold, of the town of Burlington, in the state of New York, who in a most wanton and cruel manner whipped a girl of about six years of age, seven times in the space of an hour and an half, because she did not pronounce *gig* as he required, and which caused her death—was apprehended at this place, on Monday evening last, by Mr. Thomas Cohoon, who had heard of him at Owego upon the Susquehanna, and followed him 320 miles. His apprehension was attended with singular circumstances. On Sunday he arrived here: he was unsuccessful in 3 or 4 applications he made for a passage down the river; He continued in the vicinity, upon Grant's Hill, a considerable part of the day, and was frequently upon the point of committing the dreadful act of self murder, but was happily deterred by a directing providence. Monday night he called at Mr. Henderson's tavern for something to eat, but said he had no money; in a short time Mr. Cohoon came in and was informed that a countryman of his was in the room, to whom he addressed himself, and discovered that he answered the description of Arnold —after requiring the other company to leave the room he read the advertisement; while reading, he discovered the other drawing something from his pocket, upon which he raised his eyes and said, *You are the man*, the hand dropped—it was a pistol which was cocked twice, and only prevented from doing execution by Mr. Cohoon's firmness. They took him to a magistrate, but on the way he drew a pistol and fired—a different direction was given to it by his arm being seized by a bystander; the flash of the pan singed his temple, and the ball flew by the ear of Mr. Cohoon; it however did no injury. The pistol, a number of balls, a rope and some money, were found upon him; he called himself Smith, and would give no satisfaction that night. The next day he made full confession—and appears to be fully sensible of the enormity of his crimes, deplores the violence of his passions, which have sunk him from a respectable standing in society to the lowest degradation.

Engliſh papers mention a report of an attempt to aſſaſſinate Bonaparte at one of the Pariſian theatres.

The crew of a veſſel, lately arrived at New-York, in 171 days from Bourdeaux, being out of proviſions, ſubſiſted upwards of twenty days on *ſweet oil!*

We obſerve in the papers, many complaints of the impreſſment of American ſeamen, by the Britiſh; but we ſee no meaſures taken by our government, for preventing theſe injuries.

In the Legiſlature of New-York, The bill for incorporating the MERCHANTS' BANK, after a long and violent contention, has paſſed....In Senate, by a majority of 4—in the Houſe, by a majority of 12.

The Knell.

At Boston, the Hon. PELEG COFFIN, Esq. in the 49th year of his age.

In this city on the 20th inst. Mr. ALEXANDER M'CUTCHEN, aged 28 years.

Prices Current

AT HUDSON,

[CORRECTED WEEKLY.]

Saturday, March 16, 1805.

	D.	C.
Wheat	2	31
Rye	1	19
Corn	1	00
Oats		50
Butter		21
Cheeſe		09
Lard		12
Tallow		16
Bees Wax		28

Wreath.

EXTRACT.

FROM AN IRISH PAPER.

BONAPARTE IN LOVE.

EVERY movement (Casuists sing)
Has, though of en hid, its *spring*,
Now controlling, now impelling,
Raising, sinking, soothing, swelling,
As prevails the different passion,
Love, fear, envy, av'rice, fashion,
Anger, pleasure, lust, grief, hate,
Or ambition to be great.
Musing on this mental mover,
Now, methinks, I can discover
The true motive and occasion
Of the boasted *French Invasion*:
And, that credit I may gain,
Thus the matter I explain:

All his motions lately prove
BONAPARTE is deep in love....
Love inspires his daily scheme;
Love supplies his nightly dream;
Love at Paris is his host;
Love attend him to the coast;
Love, along the Rhine's meanders,
Swamps of Holland, bogs of Flanders;
Ramble when and where he will,
Love is his companion still,
And will never let him rest,
With enjoyment while unblest.
Now, perhaps, conjecture stupid,
Thinks *his* love the flame of *Cupid*
For some *Venus*, theme of wonder....
No such thing!....'tis LOVE OF PLUNDER!

Diversity.

FROM A LONDON PAPER.

GENEALOGICAL TREE.

AT the coronation of kings and emperors, the principal genealogist of the empire or kingdom, carries in poſſeſſion the genealogical tree of the royal family before the anointed monarch.—The following is Bonaparte's genealogy, which we deem it our duty to blazon and ſet forth for the entertainment and information, of our readers:—

Mrs. Ranioglina of Baſle, married Mr. Ranioglina—and, ſecondly Mr. Feſch. She had by theſe marriages Lætitia Ranioglina, and M. Feſch now Cardinal Feſch.

Lætitia Ranioglina married Carlo Bonaparte, a recorder of a petty tribunal at Ajaccio.

Lætitia Bonaparte was afterwards miſtreſs of count Marbœuf, governor of Corſica. Her children by Carlo Bonaparte and count Marbœuf are, his imperial highneſs Joſeph Bonaparte, who married her imperial highneſs, M. M. Clary, daughter of a ſhip-broker at Marſeilles.

His imperial majeſty, Napoleon Bonaparte, who married Madame de Beauharnois, firſt the wife of count Beauharnois, and afterwards the miſtreſs of Barras.

Citizen Lucien Bonaparte. He was firſt an abbe. In 1792 he was employed in the waggon ſervice of the army of Provence, at 100l. a year. His firſt wife was a *pot girl* in the tavern of one Maximim, near Toulon—ſhe died at Neuilly in 1797, from bad treatment. His ſecond wife is Madame Jaubertholl, the divorced wife of an exchange-broker of Paris—ſhe was his miſtreſs for a year. As ſoon as ſhe was pregnant he married her.

His roval highneſs Louis Bonaparte married Mademoiſelle Beauharnois, daughter of her imperial majeſty, by her firſt huſband,

Citizen Jerome Bonaparte, married Miſs Patterſon, a very reſpectable and beautiful young lady of Baltimore.

Her imperial highneſs princeſs Eliza, the ſiſter of her imperial majeſty, married at Marſeilles Bacciochi, a ſon of a waiter at a coffee-houſe, and marker of a billiard-table at Aix la Chapelle and Spa, in 1792. The ſon carried on a ſmall trade in cotton in Switzerland.

Her imperial highneſs princeſs Matilda Bonaparte married general Murrat, ſequ[illegible] a hoſtler at an inn three miles from Cahors, in Quercy: Murat, in 1793, propoſed to change his name to Marat.

Her imperial highneſs princeſs Paulina Borgheſe, married, firſt, General Le Clerc, who was the ſon of a wool dealer at Pontoiſe. He purchaſed wool of the country people, and reſold it at Paris to the upholſterers. His mother, madame Le Clerc, was a retail dealer in corn and flour. Her brother has been ſentenced to be hanged for robbery, and the gibbet poſt yet remains in Picardy, to prove the exalted ſituation of his grandfather.

AGENTS FOR THE BALANCE.

NEW-YORK.

Kinderhook—D. Ludlow, P. M. *Albany*—Whiting, Backus & Whiting. *Utica*—M. Hitchcock, P. M. *Canandaigua*—Z. Seymour. *Manlius*—R. Wilson, P. M. *Whitestown*—R. Leavenworth, Esq. *Cherry-Valley*—Mr Holt, P. M. *Cazenovia*—E. S. Jackson and the Post Master. *Aurelius*—Samuel Crosset, P. M. *Johnstown*—Nathan Brewster, P.M. *Onondaga*—G. W. Olmstead. *Cooperstown*—F. Stranahan, Esq. *Troy*—Wright, Wilbur & Stockwell. *Herkimer*—C. Woodruff. *Little Falls*—W. Alexander, P. M. *Geneva*—the Post Master. *Sharon*—Z. Pynneo, P. M. and J. Williams.—*Lansinburgh*—G. Tracy, Printer. *Salem*—Dodd & Rumsey, Printers. *Marcellus*—Guy Humphrey, P. M. *Clinton*—J. Simonds, P. M. *Sherectady*—J. Shurtleff, P. M. *Sullivan*—E. Caulkins, P. M. *Paris*—H. M'Neil, P. M. *Pompey*—D. Wood, P. M. *Amsterdam*—Mr Downs, P. M. *Niagara*—Lt. Geo. Armistead. *Tully*—J. Buel, P. M. *Cayuga*—H. Buckley, P. M. *Pittsfield*—C. Noble, P. M. *Brownville*—G. Camp. *Skeneatelas*—Dr. Sam. Porter. *Saratoga*—A. Van Deusen, P. M. *Rhinebeck*—A. Potter, P. M. *Redbook*—M. Cantine, Esq. *Kingston*—David Burr & S. S. Freer. *Poughkeepsie*—R. S. Street, Esq. N. Power, Printer, and the Post Master. *New-York*—Michael Burnham, Publisher of the Evening Post. *Owego*—E. Dana, P. M. *Bath*—S. S. Haight and the Post Master. *Chenango Point*—C. Stone. *Walton*—W. Butler. *Unadilla*—O. Stevens. *Windham*—S. Hunt, P. M.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Stockbridge—H. Jones, P. M. *Springfield*—H. Brewer, Printer. *Pittsfield*—A. Strong, Esq. *Lanesborough*—M. Wells, P. M. *Williamstown*—Tryon & Callender. *Greenfield*—J. Denio, Printer, *Northampton*—S. Butler, P. M. *Randolph*—W. P. Whiting, P. M. *Worcester*—I. Thomas, Jun. *Boston*—J. Hastings, P. M. *Salem*—Mr. Dabney, P. M. and T. Cushing, Printer. *Nantucket*—J. Brock jun. *Plymouth*—W. Goodwin. *Leicester*—the Post Master. *Newburyport*—E. W. Allen, Printer, and J. Emerson, P. M.

CONNECTICUT.

New-Haven—Elias Beers. *Danbury*—E. R. White, P. M. and Mr. Gray, Printer. *Haddam*—the Post Master. *Farmington*, S. Richards, P. M. *Sharon* G. King, jun, P. M.

NEW-HAMPSHIRE.

Hanover—J. Baldwin, P. M. *Boscawen*—Thomas W. Thompson. *Keene*—J. G. Bond. P. M. *Chesterfield*—E. Harvey, jun. P. M.

VERMONT.

Middlebury—Huntington & Fitch, Printers. *Newbury*—D. Johnson, P. M. *Royalton*—J Smith. *St. Albans*—E. W. Keyes, Esq. *Burlington*—G. Robinson. *Putney*—P. White, P. M. *Shaftsbury*—E. Niles, P. M. *Windsor*—N. Mower, Printer.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Athens—Mr Prentice, P. M. *Wilkesbarre*—T. Welles, and Mr. Miner, Printer. *Williamsport*—S. E. Grier, P. M. *Philadelphia*—W. Maris.

NEW-JERSEY.

Trenton—Sherman & Mershon, Printers, and the Post Master. *New-Brunswick*—Mr. Blauvelt, Printer.

MARYLAND.

Baltimore—Yundt & Brown, Printers, *Easton*—Dr. R. Moore.

GEORGIA.

Augusta—D. Taylor. *Savannah*—A. Grant, and Seymour, Woolhopter & Stebbins.

OHIO.

Marietta—B. I. Gilman.

TERMS OF THE BALANCE,

FOR 1805.

To City Subscribers, Two Dollars and Fifty Cents, payable quarterly.

To those who receive them by mail, Two Dollars, payable in advance.

To those who take their papers at the office, in bundles, or otherwise, a deduction from the city price will be made.

A handsome Title Page and Table of Contents will accompany the last number of the volume.

PUBLISHED BY
HARRY CROSWELL,
Warren-Street, Hudson.
WHERE PRINTING IN GENERAL IS EXECUTED WITH ELEGANCE AND ACCURACY.